

for their courtesy in arranging loans and in permitting my examination of specimens, and to Clare B. Hardham and the late Ernest C. Twissle-mann for allowing examination of their personal collections. Ingrid Marin collected viable *V. exigua* seed from Riverside Co., California.

LITERATURE CITED

- HOWELL, J. T. 1949. Marin flora. Univ. Calif. Press, Berkeley.
 LASSETTER, J. S. 1972. A biosystematic study of the *Vicia ludoviciana* complex (Leguminosae). Ph.D. Thesis. Iowa State Univ., Ames.
 METTIN, D., and P. HANELT. 1968. Bemerkungen zur Karyologie und Systematik einiger Sippen der Gattung *Vicia* L. Feddes Repert. 77:11-30.
 MUNZ, P. A. 1959. A California flora. Univ. Calif. Press, Berkeley.
 SHRIVASTAVA, L. M. 1963. Cytogenetical studies in certain species of *Vicia*. Cytologia 28:154-169.
 SVESHNIKOVA, I. N. 1927. Karyological studies on *Vicia*. Trudy Prikl. Bot. 17-1, No. 3:37-72. Russian with English summary.
 THOMAS, J. H. 1961. Flora of the Santa Cruz Mountains of California. Stanford Univ. Press, Stanford, Calif.

CORRECTION OF THE GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF *RHUS MICROPHYLLA* (ANACARDIACEAE).—Barkley (Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 24:256-500. 1937) in his monograph of North American *Rhus* included a distribution map (pg. 388) of *Rhus microphylla* Engelm. ex Gray showing its geographic distribution as including Cedros Island and Puerto San Bartolome, Baja California, Mexico. Cedros Island and the adjacent coast were also shown as localities for *R. microphylla* by Shreve and Wiggins (*Vegetation and flora of the Sonoran Desert*, Stanford Univ. Press. 1964) and Hastings, Turner, and Warren (*An atlas of some plant distributions in the Sonoran Desert*, Univ. of Arizona. 1972). Hastings et al. pointed out that this rather formidable disjunction is puzzling, since *R. microphylla* is primarily a Chihuahuan Desert species, and that they had not seen specimens from either locality.

In spring 1972 and 1973 I specifically searched for *R. microphylla* on Cedros Island in areas that seemed suitable for its growth. I was unable to locate it, but in all these areas there was an abundance of *Pachycormus discolor* var. *veatchiana* (Kell.) Gentry. Curiously, the disjunct localities reported for *R. microphylla* in the Sonoran Desert fall within the known distribution of *P. discolor* var. *veatchiana*. Because of this and the superficial resemblance of these two species, I borrowed specimens (Cedros Island, 8 Dec 1888, *Pond s. n.*, and Port San Bartolome, 27 Nov 1889, *Pond s. n.*) from the University of Notre Dame on which this distribution of *R. microphylla* is based. Although both specimens are sterile branches, they are easily recognized as *P. discolor* and not *R. microphylla*, since the leaves are borne in fascicles (Kellogg, Proc. Calif. Acad. Sci. 2:24. 1860). Also, on the specimen from Cedros Island there is a card written by Lt. Pond stating, "low shrubby bush 18 inches high, four feet across, branching at the ground into four stems, two inches each in diameter, bark peeling, single stem from a tree like above six feet high, six inches thick." The thick stem and peeling bark are both characteristic of *P. discolor* but not *R. microphylla*. I have annotated these specimens as *Pachycormus discolor* var. *veatchiana*. Oddly, they were not annotated by Barkley as *R. microphylla*. *Rhus microphylla* is restricted to the southwestern United States and northern mainland Mexico, but it does not occur in Baja California. I thank Dr. T. Crovello of ND for the loan of the *Pachycormus* specimens.—DAVID A. YOUNG, Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden, Claremont, California 91711.